



REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 33-64 are pending in the application. Claim 44 is amended herein. The Applicant hereby requests further examination and reconsideration of the application in view of the foregoing amendments and these remarks.

Claim Objections

In paragraph 2 of the office action, the Examiner objected to claim 44 because of an informality. In response, the Applicant has amended claim 44 as suggested by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections

In paragraph 4, the Examiner rejected claims 33-34, 44, 57-58, and 62 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Shalom. In paragraph 6, the Examiner rejected claims 35-36, 51-52, and 59 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shalom in view of Dent. In paragraph 7, the Examiner rejected claims 37, 45, 56, and 64 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shalom in view of Dent in view of McNicol. In paragraph 8, the Examiner rejected claim 43 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shalom in view of Kenington. In paragraph 9, the Examiner rejected claims 46, 53, and 55 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shalom in view of Dent, in view of McNicol and further in view of Faulkner. In paragraph 10, the Examiner rejected claim 54 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shalom in view of Voyce. In paragraph 11, the Examiner objected to claims 38-42, 47-50, 60-61, and 63 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but indicated that those claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. For the following reasons, the Applicant submits that all of the pending claims are allowable over the cited references.

Shalom is a U.S. patent having a priority date of May 11, 1999. The present application claims priority via PCT application PCT/GB00/00407 to British patent application 9903179.1 filed on February 12, 1999. As such, Shalom is not a proper prior-art reference under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) with respect to the present application. The Applicant submits therefore that all of the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) and 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are improper because they all rely on Shalom. The Applicant submits therefore that the rejections of claims under Sections 102(e) and 103(a) have been overcome.

In a telephonic interview on 6/12/06 with the Applicant's below-named attorney, the Examiner confirmed that Shalom is not a proper prior-art reference under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) with respect to the present application.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the Applicant believes that the now-pending claims are in condition for allowance. Therefore, the Applicant believes that the entire application is now in condition for allowance, and early and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 6/12/06
Customer No. 22186
Mendelsohn & Associates, P.C.
1500 John F. Kennedy Blvd., Suite 405
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19102

Steve Mendelsohn
Steve Mendelsohn
Registration No. 35,951
Attorney for Applicant
(215) 557-6657 (phone)
(215) 557-8477 (fax)